

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF MAINE

BRICE CANTRELL,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	2:23-cv-00283-SDN
	)	
BRUNSWICK MAINE POLICE, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**ORDER**

Before the Court are two objections to Magistrate Judge Wolf's July 16, 2025, order denying Plaintiff Brice Cantrell's "nonsensical and frivolous motions." ECF Nos. 105, 106, 108.<sup>1</sup>

The two objections at issue contain no legal analysis or explanations as to why Magistrate Judge Wolf's ruling was improper. Indeed, the objection at ECF No. 106 is simply a printed copy of the Magistrate Judge's Text Order with handwritten text stating, "I object to denying motion (99) Binding Precedent." On the other end of the spectrum is the filing at ECF No. 108 which contains nine pages of various, apparently irrelevant paragraphs that concludes by attempting to charge this Court with "piracy ashore." ECF No. 108 at 3. These filings are indeed "nonsensical and frivolous": To the extent that Mr. Cantrell is seeking particular action from the Court, he should explain what he is seeking and the legal basis for it. The Court is obliged to reiterate Magistrate Judge Wolf's warning to Mr. Cantrell that repeated groundless and frivolous filings may result in sanctions up to and including dismissal of this action and future filing restrictions. *See Cok v. Fam. Ct.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff's objection is filed at ECF No. 106. Plaintiff also filed ECF No. 108 which I will construe as a supplement to ECF No. 106.

*of R.I.*, 985 F.2d 32 (1st Cir. 1993) (requiring that the Court warn any litigant before restricting the litigant's ability to file).

For these reasons, the Court **DENIES** Mr. Cantrell's objections to Magistrate Judge Wolf's order. ECF Nos. 106, 108.

**So ORDERED.**

Dated this 24th day of September, 2025.

/s/ Stacey D. Neumann  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**